UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

TPI-1

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

DATE: April 15, 1969

In reply refer to:

TO : SEE DISTRIBUTION BELOW

FROM : Administrator, UMTA

SUBJECT: Task Force Report on Urban Mass Transportation Legislation

Attached is a Task Force Report on Urban Mass Transportation legislation prepared at my request during the last four days. The Task Force Report discusses possible program elements, funding levels, duration of funding, and revenue sources. These elements can be put together in different ways and each implies a series of major policy decisions. Four illustrative legislative packages are summarized in tables attached to the report.

You are invited and urged to attend a meeting at 10:00 a.m., Wednesday, April 16, Conference Rooms 8A and B, to discuss and reach decisions on the major policy issues and principle program components of urban mass transportation legislation to which the President has now committed himself.

It is urgent that all of the necessary basic decisions on policy and program components be reached at this meeting if the Task Force is to develop a draft bill, the section-by-section analysis, a justification for the proposal and necessary letters of transmittal within the time schedule established by the Secretary.

It is my understanding that a completed legislative proposal is to be submitted to the White House by May 1. I understand further that Mr. Moynihan has requested a briefing before formal transmittal and I suggest that we be ready to make a presentation to the Urban Affairs Council or to Mr. Moynihan by Monday, April 28.

C. C. Villarreal

Attachment

C. C. Villarreal

DISTRIBUTION

The Under Secretary
Deputy Under Secretary
Assistant Secretary for Policy and International Affairs
Assistant Secretary for Urban Systems and Environment
The General Counsel
Director, Congressional Relations

Eno
Center for Transportation

REPORT

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

TASK FORCE ON

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION LEGISLATION

April 15, 1969

Gordon M. Murray, Chairman, UMTA
Milton L. Brooks, Executive Secretary, UMTA
Martin Convisser, S-41
David M. Schwartz, TPI-20
J. Thomas Tidd, TGC-40

Eno
Center for
Transportation

FORWARD

This Task Force was convened by the Urban Mass Transportation Administrator to provide staff support for the Department's consideration of new legislation to meet urban mass transportation needs.

This Report is intended to provide a basis for initial policy decisions covering the major elements of a legislative proposal.

The Report attempts to (1) clarify the problems and opportunities that might underlie a legislative proposal; (2) identify and analyze the major issues involved in a legislative proposal and the range of alternatives associated with each element; and (3) illustrate potential packages that could form the basis for a legislative proposal. The Task Force has not attempted to reach agreement on a single recommended package.

It is expected that the subsequent work of the Task Force will involve development of a draft bill and justification implementing the policy decisions taken with respect to the major issues identified in this Report.

The Task Force members wish to acknowledge the assistance received from members of their staffs, particularly the contributions of William J. Driscoll, TGC-40, and Robert H. Bruton, TPI-20.

Eno
Center for
Transportation

I. PROGRAM PURPOSE

The decline of mass transportation in the past 25 years has several reasons and several adverse results. How one views these reasons and results determines, in part, what sort of mass transportation legislative program should be proposed. Questions of political feasibility will also weigh heavily in determining the nature of the legislative package.

The reasons for the decline of mass transit include:

-- The general attractiveness to the public of the private automobile as a mode of transportation, and the increasing affluence which has allowed growing numbers of consumers to purchase automobiles;

-- The dispersion of the urban population into low density suburbs, where mass transportation has had less of a relative advantage than in the higher density cities;

-- The relatively large amounts of Federal funds which have been available to support highway expenditures in urban areas ($2.2 billion in FY 1970), compared to the much smaller amounts which only recently have been made available for mass transportation ($175 million in FY 1970);

-- The fact that mass transportation costs must be paid by the user every time he rides a mass transportation vehicle, whereas the automobile user does not "feel" all his costs directly when he uses his car;

-- The regulatory and political pressure to keep mass transit fares low, which has necessitated a decrease in quality (studies have shown that mass transit users are generally willing to pay increased costs in order to receive increased quality of service);

-- The lack of a political mechanism at the local level which can deal with the problem effectively across the several political jurisdictions normally extant in major metropolitan areas.

Eno
Center for
Transportation

The adverse effects of the decline of mass transit include:

-- Growing difficulties for those who cannot afford private transportation or who cannot use it readily (e.g., the aged, young, poor and handicapped);

-- Increased public costs for streets and highways to handle the accompanying growth in automobile traffic, and the accompanying social costs of highway construction;

-- Congestion, and the noise, pollution and other negative features associated with congestion;

-- The further impetus the decline has given to dispersed land development, which in turn, reinforces the decline in transit and the increasing costs of public services.

Based on these reasons and effects, the Federal mass transportation assistance program could be based on one or a combination of the following program purposes:

-- Improving local capacity to plan and implement sound development programs in general, and transportation programs in particular, especially across current political jurisdictions within metropolitan areas. Programs oriented toward this purpose could include emphasis on planning prerequisites, requirements for and support of Metropolitan Development Agencies, and flexible transportation block grants.

-- Supporting transportation investments that can facilitate the creation of viable new communities to house future population growth.

-- Supporting transportation investments that can stimulate the redevelopment of present urban areas.

-- Improving the cost/effectiveness of urban transportation systems. High quality mass transportation systems appear to be more cost/effective than private automobile systems for some urban transportation purposes, primarily for peak-hour commutation. However, political, administrative and institutional barriers, including large implicit subsidies to automobile commutation, have heavily weighted the scales toward the less cost/effective solution. A program aimed toward rectifying this situation could include grants to mass transportation systems, preferential treatment of mass transportation vehicles on highways,

Eno Center for Transportation

and special peak-hour charges for highway usage.

-- Preserving or improving mass transportation for the poor. Since many urban poor cannot afford private automobiles, preserving some form of urban mass transportation is almost a social necessity. A mass transportation grant program, possibly operating subsidies, could be directed toward this goal.

-- Maintaining and improving the quality of mass transportation for those who choose to use it. This purpose is similar to the previous one, although its orientation is broader than just the poor and the disadvantaged. Mass transportation capital or operating grants would be an appropriate vehicle to serve this purpose.

The following section deals in more detail with the kinds of programs and activities that could be included in a mass transportation legislative package.

Eno
Center for
Transportation

II. PROGRAM COMPONENTS

The Federal Urban Mass Transportation program presently authorizes:

-- loans and grants for capital improvements

-- research, development and demonstrations, and

-- grants for technical studies, university research and training, and managerial fellowships

The need for continuation of these current activities hinges on an assessment of whether financing in the amounts required could be generated by project operations or would be forthcoming from the private money market or whether the structure of a Federal subsidy is necessary or desirable to encourage communities to use transit as a positive tool for influencing urban development and meeting other social and economic objectives.

Any combination of the following new program components could be added to UMTA's authority:

-- Operating subsidies are now prohibited on the grounds that they would involve UMTA too deeply in the day-to-day operations and policies of transit operators and remove incentives to prudent local management and labor relations. But in many cases an operating subsidy could substitute for a more expensive capital project or could help cover the initial "start up costs" of innovative new service concepts.

-- Advance acquisition of right-of-way would allow communities to facilitate investments planned for the future by acquiring needed right-of-way while land prices are lower and before inconsistent development occurs (such as allowing an abandoned railroad line to be preserved for future transit rather than revert to other private uses). Advance acquisition allows more orderly transportation planning and staging of investment programs, as well as reducing future dislocation problems. For these reasons a substantial revolving fund

Eno Center for Transportation

providing interest-free 100% loans for advance acquisition of highway right-of-way was provided in the 1968 Highway Act. Mass transit could be given this same advantage by (1) changing the Highway Act to include transit right-of-way as well as highway, (2) including advance acquisition for both transit and highway in any block grant for urban transportation, or (3) by including such authority in an expanded mass transit program.

-- Excess land acquisition would allow local bodies to acquire land in excess of actual right-of-way requirements in order to control the use made of property adjacent to the system or its terminals. This provides the community with the means to protect its transportation plans and investments from incompatible development and to recoup for the public a portion of the increased land values that result from the public investment. This could be implemented by allowing Federal loans to be made for excess acquisition, with the "profit" from such land being reinvested in urban mass transportation -- at least until the block grant principle is extended beyond transportation programs. Utilization of such authority would require State or local legislation in many areas.

-- TOPICS and fringe parking demonstrations are components under the Federal Highway Program which could be combined with mass transit in a broader trust fund or block grant program. UMTA already has authority to assist parking facilities and the objectives of the TOPICS program complement those of urban mass transportation.

-- Urban highway construction or airport development could also be included with any or all of the above in an Urban Transportation Trust Fund or Urban Transportation Block Grant.

-- All Federal grants for transportation, including all highway construction, highway safety and beautification, airway and airport development, port development and navigation projects could be included with mass transit in an overall Transportation Trust Fund or Block Grant. (Possibly aviation and maritime operating subsidies should also be included.)

Eno
Center for
Transportation

III. MECHANISMS FOR PROVIDING FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

There are a number of different instruments or mechanisms for providing Federal assistance to communities. The choice among these alternatives basically involves (1) the degree of subsidy desired; (2) the basis on which support is to be provided (including project vs. block grant), (3) differing degrees of private money market participation; or (4) methods to spread the budgetary impact of Federal assistance.

The "subsidy issue" basically determines the choice between a grant program and a loan program. Different types of Federal loan instruments do involve some element of subsidy, but no loan program can be effective where the objectives require substantial subsidies.

If the problem is essentially one of difficulties in the money market, the various loan instruments can be considered on the basis of their effectiveness in overcoming the obstacle and their budgetary impact. The major instruments are:

-- Direct Federal loans to the implementing agency, normally at an interest rate just above the Treasury borrowing rate. This keeps interest charges to a minimum and allows repayment terms to be more favorable than commercial loans. The subsidy element here is the relatively small difference between Treasury and commercial (tax exempt) rates. The budget program must reflect the entire amount of such loans.

-- Interest subsidy may be given in association with a direct loan by charging interest rates at less than the cost of Treasury borrowing at any level down to zero; or such a subsidy may be provided by providing for Federal payment of any desired portion of the interest on a commercial loan, such as the difference between the commercial rate on taxable bonds vs. tax exempts. In the case of direct interest subsidy, budget totals reflect only the amount of the subsidy to be paid.

Eno Center for Transportation

-- Loan guarantees allow private financing to become available where it would not otherwise be or at more favorable interest rates. Loan guarantees do not show up in budget totals. Federal guarantees of tax-exempt local securities inevitably become an issue.

Where program objectives require sizeable Federal subsidies in order to be effective, the basic mechanism is the direct grant. The alternative approaches here involve whether the grant is categorical and project-by-project or whether it is broader and allows greater flexibility in use (i.e., some form of block grant).

-- Categorical grants are available for a single purpose and are given on the basis of a project-by-project review (e.g., present highway and mass transit programs). This approach gives Federal authorities maximum impact on the direction and use of grant funds, but also runs the risk that differing terms, and conditions or availability as between programs will distort local decision-making.

-- Block grants are available for broader purposes and are not tied to specific projects. They allow flexibility to develop broad programs to meet changing community needs. This approach eliminates the various categorical conditions and differing matching requirements that may distort local decisions and reduces the inflexibility of long-term categorical programs in the use of Federal resources. Federal support for mass transit could be provided as part of an "Urban Transportation" block grant also including TOPICS and Fringe Parking from the Federal-Aid Highway Program, and possibly even urban highway construction. A General Transportation Block Grant could also include the Department's other assistance programs.

Continuation of a categorical grant program for mass transit could provide some of the advantages of block grants by providing Federal assistance on the basis of comprehensive areawide programs for transit improvements rather than individual projects.

Eno
Center for
Transportation

If the present form of grant program is retained, project grants could be provided in the form of

-- Annual Contribution contracts which have the effect of spreading the total Federal grant over the life of the project through annual amortization payments. This has the advantage of reducing the initial budget impact of the program, but does so at the expense of the interest and higher administrative costs over the life of the project, and adds friction in intergovernmental relations.

Eno
Center for
Transportation

IV. PROGRAM LEVEL AND DURATION

The current mass transit program is funded at $175 million for FY 1970, of which approximately $130 million is for grants (the remainder being for research and demonstrations, technical assistance, and other small programs). This level does not begin to make a dent in the capital requirements of rail rapid transit systems in being or planned. The capital cost of the BART System in the San Francisco area, for example, will be financed primarily by a $792 million local bond issue, which would all be eligible for Federal 2/3 sharing under the current program. Obviously, the entire Federal program at current levels could be devoted for several years entirely to the development of the BART System. A report prepared for HUD in 1966, based on discussions with planning bodies and transit companies, estimated capital requirements for existing, planned and likely fixed rail rapid transit systems for the 1965-75 period at $8.6 billion. Other estimates have been higher.

In addition, there is the lack of assurance to urban areas that this is a long-term program upon which they can base future planning and bond referenda. The program is now funded one year in advance (i.e., funds have already been appropriated for FY 1970). The Highway Trust Fund, by comparison, has a legislative duration until FY 1974.

Eno
Center for
Transportation

If a decision is made that the program should help finance rail rapid transit systems on the same basis as bus systems, as the current program does, then a program level building up to $1 billion annually within the next few years would not be unreasonable on programmatic grounds. The basic inhibition against such a level would be political, fiscal and administrative.

On the other hand, if the program is going to impose firm cost/effectiveness criteria, which would tend to slow up all grant projects and to weed out some potential new rail rapid transit systems, a lower level might meet the requirements.

In light of these considerations, the program level could range from the current level of approximately $175 million annually to about $1 billion annually.

With respect to duration, the program could continue with the one-year advance appropriation, or continuity could be provided through multi-year contract authorizations if general fund financing continues, or through a multi-year trust fund.

A major consideration in determining the initial duration of a long-term mass transit financing program is the planned completion of the Interstate Highway Program in 1974 and the scheduled termination of the Highway Trust Fund at that time. In order to respond to the statutory requirement for reports to the Congress in January 1970 and 1972 on future

Eno
Center for
Transportation

highway needs, the Department and the Administration will have to complete a comprehensive, multimodal evaluation of transportation needs and alternatives and develop proposals for a post-Interstate transportation program.

A Mass Transit program extending until FY 1974 could facilitate the implementation of new approaches to urban transportation problems and a restructuring of Federal assistance programs in the post-Interstate program.

On the other hand, a four-year mass transit program may not provide sufficient continuity to facilitate effective local planning and decision-making.

Eno
Center for
Transportation

V. FINANCING THE FEDERAL PROGRAM

Regardless of the forms in which Federal assistance will be given, there are alternative ways to structure the framework for providing that assistance and the flow of funds into that framework.

Most Federal activities are funded by annual appropriation action by Congress, in which the program's direction, scope and priorities can be reexamined each year by both the Executive and the Congress. Often the basic substantive legislation establishing a program may impose specific authorization ceilings on the program by year or in lump sum for several years. Sometimes authorizations must be passed each year by the substantive legislative committee before the Appropriation Committee can act.

But the process of annual authorization/appropriation may prevent effective utilization of a program in situations where long planning cycles, public consent-gaining, or elaborate financing arrangements must precede a project. Lack of continuity from year to year and uncertainty about the availability of assistance can discourage use of such programs as Mass Transit because local officials have no assurance that, once they have undertaken these arduous arrangements, assistance will be available.

There are two basic alternative approaches to giving a program long-term continuity and funding.

Eno
Center for
Transportation

General Fund Approach.

The simpliest and most straight-forward method is for Congress to provide obligational authority for the desired number of years at the desired program level. This mechanism establishes the program levels in advance, and the authority becomes available automatically each year. The general fund approach does not require earmarking of revenues or imposition of new taxes, although compensating tax increases or user charges could be imposed.

Trust Fund Approach.

The trust fund approach accomplishes the basic objective in virtually the same way as the general fund -- automatic availability of funds for the desired number of years. But it also establishes a particular source of funds by earmarking specified tax revenues into a trust fund account and limiting the program to the revenues produced. In general trust funds have the disadvantage of being difficult to control, because earmarked revenues cannot be used for other purposes and the program will normally use all available funds regardless of changes in overall national priorities. But the Congress is reluctant to provide the desired long-term financing for a program without the assurance of pay-as-you-go that a trust fund can provide(although it has never seriously considered the converse problem). The Highway Trust Fund, for example, reflected a resolve that the new investments needed would be paid for out of current revenues, and new gas taxes

Eno
Center for
Transportation

were imposed as "user charges" to provide the earmarked revenues. There was, therefore, a direct connection between the earmarked revenues and the program funded by the Trust Fund. Subsequently political pressures have been applied exclusively to compelling the expenditures of all available revenues on the originally indicated purpose.

A decision on the source of revenues to be earmarked for a trust fund depends on the scope of program to be supported, the question of new user taxes, and political considerations.

If the fund is to support all transportation activities of the Department (highways, transit, airways, and airports) major new sources of revenues would have to be found and it would be difficult (at least initially) to avoid subsidy or cross-subsidy even if new user charges were imposed.

If the fund were restricted to Urban Transportation (transit, TOPICS, fringe parking, advance acquisition, and possibly construction) it would be possible to break off a piece of the present Highway Trust Fund and allow present revenues to cover mass transit as well. This approach would still involve cross-subsidization between auto and non-auto users.

Eno
Center for
Transportation

If a trust fund were to be established solely to support present or expanded mass transit programs, revenues could be earmarked from any combination of the following sources or phased to shift from one to another source:

-- Auto Excise Tax. Each percentage point of tax yields $200 million. Any desired program level could be achieved by earmarking the desired portion of the tax.

A permanent auto excise of 5% (7% now, and the administration has recommended retention at 7% rather than scheduled drop to 5% in January) could support a $1 billion program. As a tax on transportation, there is some justification for earmarking auto excise taxes for transportation users, particularly since road users benefit from transit investments. There is also some rough justice in considering the auto excise as a kind of peak hour urban travel user charge.

An obstacle to use of auto excises is the previous commitments and pressures for elimination of the tax entirely, and the necessity for positive Congressional action to extend it. Also, if the revenues are used to support urban transportation it would constitute a cross-subsidy between rural and urban users and if they are used to support only transit there would still be a cross-subsidy between auto and transit users.

-- Gasoline Fuel Tax. Each cent per gallon yields approximately $780 million per year. The same equities that apply to the auto excise tax apply to the gas tax as well. In addition the gas tax is widely considered to be the exclusive source for Federal and State highway construction revenues and any attempt to tap this source would be considered as diversion of highway revenues.

-- Other Excise Taxes (e.g., cigarette, liquor, electricty, advertising). A 10% increase in the liquor tax would yield $340 million per year. Each 1¢ of cigarette tax yields about $250 million per year. Excises could be imposed on electricity consumption or transmission or cigarette (or all) advertising to achieve any level of revenues desired. To the extent that such taxes are ultimately borne only by middle or upper income individuals they may be easier to impose, but if their incidence is fairly wide, such taxes would be highly regressive.

Eno Center for Transportation

These sources have no connection with transit or transportation use and it would therefore be difficult to justify their application to transportation as against any other Federal program. Tieing any particular Federal program to revenue derived from cigaretts or cigarette advertising, for example, may also create vested interests that would oppose desired Federal action against such items for health or safety reasons.

-- New User Charges. If it were believed that transit users or beneficiaries in any community should pay for their own transit investments, no Federal subsidies or user charges would be needed. If cross-subsidization were desired within local areas to benefit transit users, financing mechanisms could be devised in each area and no Federal subsidy or user charges would be needed.

On the other hand, a package of Federal user charges such as peak-hour tolls on congested highways or a parking tax could provide a mechanism for increasing the efficiency of existing transportation facilities and providing revenues for new transit investments. Such charges could be imposed Federally to finance part of a transit or urban transportation program, or locally as a source for their contribution.

Such charges serve primarily a regulatory and allocation function -- i.e., the greater the charge and the more effective it is, the less the revenues produced. But they could be part of any package for expanded transit or urban transportation programs, either as a direct Federal charge or as requirement imposed on localities as a condition of assistance.

Eno
Center for
Transportation

VI. ALTERNATIVE LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

This Report has attempted to:

-- identify the problems and opportunities to which a new mass transportation or urban transportation legislative program might respond, and

-- identify the necessary elements of such a proposal and the alternatives available for each element.

These alternatives can be combined in an infinite number of ways, and the selection of a complete package will depend on the weight one attaches to various purposes or objectives.

The Task Force has not attempted to reach agreement on a single package as its recommended legislative proposal. Rather, it has sought to identify and discuss the range of alternatives available and to present this analysis in a manner that can facilitate Departmental policy decisions.

In order to facilitate policy decisions, the following packages have been devised as illustrative legislative initiatives. They do not cover the entire range of possible combinations. They can be taken apart and recombined. They simply attempt to reflect realistically the boundaries within which the Department's options probably fall.

A number of subordinate issues follow from the major decisions. These have to do with the detailed implementation and the general terms, conditions, and limitations for the program ultimately constituted. Policy decisions on any issues arising at this level can be resolved subsequently during the review of draft legislation.

Eno
Center for
Transportation

UMTA LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM ALTERNATIVE 1

Type of Funding	Trust Fund	Urban Mass Transportation			
Term of Program	4 years	FY 1971	FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
		-- Coincides with termination of Highway Trust Fund -- Relates to classification study and needs study -- Affords opportunity for comprehensive review			
Level of Program	Moderate Increase	$300 million	$400 million	$500 million	$600 million
		-- Reasonable transition from FY 1970 ($200 million) -- Reasonable subsequent step increases within earmarked revenue potential			
Source of Funds	Auto Excise Tax	1.5% pts	2% pts	2.5% pts	3% pts
		-- Yield is currently $200 million per % point			
Funding Mechanism	Present	Grants (and loans)			
Scope of Program	Some Expansion	-- All present programs -- Advance acquisition of right-of-way -- Excess land acquisition* -- Improved relocation assistance			

*Profits not realized until 1975.

Eno
Center for Transportation

UMTA LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM ALTERNATIVE 2

Type of Funding	Trust Fund	Urban Mass Transportation			
Term of Program	4 years	FY 1971	FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974
		-- Coincides with termination of Highway Trust Fund -- Relates to classification study and needs study -- Affords opportunity for comprehensive review			
Level of Program	Moderate Increase	$250 million	$350 million	$450 million	$500 million
		-- Reasonable transition from FY 1970 ($175 million) -- Reasonable subsequent step increases within earmarked revenue potential			
Source of Funds	Alt. A Auto Excise Tax	1.25% pts	1.75% pts	2.25% pts	2.5% pts
	Alt. B Cigarette Tax	1¢ per pack	1.4¢ per pack	1.8¢ per pack	2.0¢ per pack
Funding Mechanism	Present	Grants (and loans)			
Scope of Program	Some Expansion	-- All present programs -- Advance acquisition of right-of-way -- Excess land acquisition* -- Improved relocation assistance			

*Profits not realized until 1975.

Eno
Center for Transportation

UMTA LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM ALTERNATIVE 3

Type Funding	Trust Fund	Urban Mass Transportation				
Term of Program	10 years (increase)	FY 1971	FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974	FY 1975-80
		-- Assures local governments of continuing Federal Program as basis for planning, committing, funding large new systems.				
Level of Program	Substantial Increase	$300 million	$400 million	$600 million	$800 million	$1000 million
		-- Reasonable transition from FY 1970 ($175 million) -- Permits assistance to large rail-rapid systems -- Within earmarked revenue potential				
Source of Funds	Auto Excise Tax	1.5% points	2% points	3% points	--	--
	Alt. A. Differential urban highway user charges	--	--	?	$800 million	$1000 million
				Effectiveness of tax inverse to yield		
	Alt. B. Cigarette (or other sumptuary) levy	--	--	$500 million .02 per pack	$750 million .03 per pack	$1000 million .04 per pack
	Share of Profit from Excess Land	--	--	--	--	$125 million
				Yield shared with local governments; no early return; exceedingly difficult to project		
Funding Mechanism	Present	Grants (and loans)				
Scope of Program	Substantial Expansion	-- All present programs -- Advance acquisition of right-of-way (could be financed by Highway Trust Fund on option of local government) -- Excess land acquisition -- Improved relocation assistance -- Operating subsidies ($50-70 million annually) -- Elements of TOPICS - Fringe Parking Program ($50 million beginning in 1972)				
Local Initiative	Moderate Change	Move toward block grants; increased program flexibility				

Eno Center for Transportation

UMTA LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM ALTERNATIVE 4

Type Funding	Trust Fund	Urban Transportation Block Grants				
Term of Program	15 years (increase)	FY 1971	FY 1972	FY 1973	FY 1974	FY 1975-85
Level of Program	Substantial Increase	$750 million	$850 million	$950 million	$1050 million	$2000 million
	Urban ABC Highway & TOPICS	450	450	450	450	
	Mass Transit	300	400	500	600	Block Grants
Source of Funds	Excise Taxes -- Share of existing Highway Trust Fund -- Auto excise - temporary -- Differential urban hwy. user charges -- Cigarette (or other sumptuary) levy -- Source of profit from excess land	To cover program requirements				
Funding Mechanism	Present	Grants and Loans FY 1971 . . . . . FY 1974 Present Program Requirements				FY 1975-85 New Formula for Block Grants (addt'l plng constraints)
Scope of Program	Massive Expansion and Consolidation	— All present UMTA programs — All urban highway programs, except Interstate — Excess land acquisition — Uniform relocation assistance				
Local Initiative	Substantial Change	Block Grants after 1974; increased program flexibility.				

Eno
Center for Transportation